



## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 10 are amended; claims 2-9 and 11-49 are canceled; new claim 50 is added; and claims 1, 10 and 50 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 stands rejected as being anticipated by Sorensen or De Boer. Claim 1 is amended to overcome such rejections, and applicant believes that the amended claim is now in condition for allowance.

Amended claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising a plurality of rotating radiation conduits extending through a susceptor to proximate a spinning substrate. The claim further recites that the rotating conduits channel radiation from annular regions of the spinning substrate to a plurality of stationary radiation conduits. Additionally, the claim recites that a plurality of outer rotating radiation conduits are associated with an outer of the annular regions, and that such plurality of outer rotating radiation conduits channels radiation to a single of the stationary radiation conduits. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by figures 6, 7 and 10 of the originally-filed application; with figure 7 showing an outer annular region 122 having a plurality of rotating conduits therein, and figure 10 showing a single stationary conduit 170 into which radiation from the outer rotating conduits is channeled.

Amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of Sorensen and De Boer for at least the reason that there is no teaching within such references of the recited plurality of outer rotating conduits channeling radiation to a single stationary conduit.

Applicant notes that claim 7 of the originally-filed application was rejected over a combination of De Boer and Adams, with Adams being utilized to show an apparatus in

which optical fibers are split so that more than one optical fiber conduit can channel radiation to a single receiving optical fiber conduit. Applicant further notes, however, that Adams, like De Boer and Sorensen does not show or suggest the recited plurality of outer rotating conduits channeling radiation to a single stationary conduit of amended claim 1. Thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over any combination of Adams, De Boer and Sorensen.


Claims 10 and 50 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1. Applicant notes that new claim 50 is supported by the originally-filed application at, for example, figures 12-14 and the text at paragraph 0059, and therefore does not comprise "new matter".

It is noted that the references of McMillin and Rocha-Alvarez were cited against claims of the application in the July 11, 2006 Office Action. However, such references, like the above-discussed references of Adams, De Boer and Sorensen do not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 10 and 50.

Claims 1, 10 and 50 are allowable for the reasons discussed above, and applicant therefore requests formal allowance of such claims in the Examiner's next action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/22/06

By:   
David G. Latwesen, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 38,533